

### REMARKS

Claims 43-102 are pending in the application with claims 43, 47, 51, 55, 59, 64, 69, 74, 79, 83, 87, 91, 95 and 99 being independent. Claims 43, 47, 51, 55, 59, 64, 69 and 74 have been amended to recite that "an electric field applied substantially in parallel with a surface of the first substrate controls whether a light passes through the liquid crystal display device or not" as set forth at pages 19-20 of the application. Claims 79-102 have been added and find support in the application at, for example, Figs. 5 and 8A, the last full paragraph of page 16, and the claims as originally filed. In particular, each of the new independent claims recites that a common electrode (e.g., 404 of Fig. 5) is over the substrate (e.g., the lower 401 of Fig. 5), a liquid crystal (e.g., 413 of Fig. 5) is over the thin film transistor and the common electrode, a transparent conductive material (e.g., 414 of Fig. 8A in view of the last full paragraph of page 16) is over the liquid crystal, and the liquid crystal is located between the substrate and the transparent conductive material. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 43-78 have been rejected as being anticipated by Yamada (JP06-118426). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Yamada does not describe or suggest an arrangement in which an electric field applied substantially in parallel with a surface of the first substrate controls whether light passes through the liquid crystal display device or not, as recited in each of independent claims 43, 47, 51, 55, 59, 64, 69 and 74. This arrangement, which may be referred to as employing a super TFT driving method, is very effective in reducing light leakage and contrast reduction resulting from the angle of visibility relative to conventional TN and STN methods.

By contrast, Yamada is directed to a TN type liquid crystal display device. In particular, while Yamada may describe applying an electric field in parallel with a substrate surface, this electric field is applied for the purpose of creating regions having different tilts within a pixel and does not control whether a light passes through the liquid crystal display device or not, as recited in each of the amended independent claims.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Similarly to the other independent claims, each of new independent claims 79, 83, 87, 91, 95 and 99 recites that an electric field applied by an electrode and a common electrode that are both over a common substrate controls whether a light passes through the liquid crystal display device or not. Accordingly, these claims and their dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons discussed above.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

The fee in the amount of \$2,850 in payment of the excess claims fees (\$2400) and the Two-Month Extension of Time fee (\$450) is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/21/06

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John F. Hayden

Reg. No. 37,640

**Customer No. 26171**  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W. - 11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331  
/adt

07977-106004 proposed amendment.doc